

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated August 1, 2006. Claims 1, 7, 23, 34, 44, 48, 51-52 are amended. Claims 22, 43, 50, and 56 are cancelled. No claims are added. As a result, claims 1-21, 23-42, 44-49, and 51-55 are now pending in this patent application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12, 14-16, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 35-42, 47, 50 and 51 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims

Claims 21, 34, 48, and 54-56 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

- Claims 1-21 and 23-42 have been rendered allowable because Applicant has incorporated the language of allowable claim 22 into its base claim, that is, independent claim 1, thereby rendering claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-21, and 23-42 allowable. Claim 22 has been cancelled since its language has been incorporated into independent claim 1.
- Claim 43 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.
- Claims 44-49 and 51 have been rendered allowable because Applicant has incorporated the language of allowable claim 50 into its base claim, that is, independent claim 44, thereby rendering claim 44 and its dependent claims 45-49 and 51 allowable. Claim 50 has been cancelled since its language has been incorporated into independent claim 44.
- Claims 52-55 have been rendered allowable because Applicant has incorporated the language of allowable claim 56 into its base claim, that is, independent claim 52, thereby rendering claim 52 and its dependent claims 52-55 allowable. Claim 56 has been cancelled since its language has been incorporated into independent claim 52.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are now in a form indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. However, if the Examiner should disagree, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's counsel, Suneel Arora, at 612-373-6951, to address any minor issues

that may remain. In sum, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims that remain pending in this case.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement. Applicant respectfully traverses on the grounds that the present specification, at page 2, lines 1-11, would explain to one of ordinary skill in the art how to adapt a system for 4-8 cm coupling, having efficiency of 10%, to a system for 10 cm coupling, as set forth in the originally-filed claim 21 (which constitutes a part of the present specification), by permitting a reduction in efficiency from 10% down to 1%. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 21.

Claims 7-9, 34, 48 and 52-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Accordingly, Applicant has amended these claims to overcome this rejection. With respect to the term “APM,” Applicant has considered the Examiner’s recommendation to write out the term for this acronym, that is, “Advanced Patient Management.” However, to further avoid any possibility of concerns about the definiteness of the term “Advanced Patient Management,” Applicant has further substituted the term “centralized patient management system,” which is used to describe such an APM system, such as at page 5, line 18 of the specification of the present patent application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7-9, 34, 48 and 52-56.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

First, claims 1-11, 13, 17-20, 24, 27-29, 31 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hall et al. (U.S. 2005/0043605). Second, claims 44-46, 49, 52 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gord et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,876,425). Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been overcome by the present claim amendments that have adopted the Examiner’s indications of allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these bases of rejection of these claims.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R 1.83(a). Figure 1 of the drawings has been amended to show the claimed bed and mattress, and the corresponding portion of the specification has been amended to include reference numbers to the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection to the drawings.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6951 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.


Respectfully submitted,

JOHN D. HATLESTAD

By his Representatives,


SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6951

Date November 1, 2006

By 
Suneel Arora
Reg. No. 42,267

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 1 day of November 2006.


Name


Signature